REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 3, 6, 15, 16, 17, 21 and 22 have been amended herein. A listing of all claims can be found at pages 3-5 of this Reply.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I.   **Rejection of Claims 1, 5-7, 13-17 and 19-22 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 1, 5-7, 13-17 and 19-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bates *et al.* (U.S. Application No. 2003/0221185) in view of Bates (U.S. 7,251,808), referred to as Bates_2. It is respectfully submitted that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Neither Bates *et al.* nor Bates_2, alone or in combination, teach or suggest each and every element of the subject claims.

> [T]he prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all claim limitations. *See* MPEP §706.02(j). The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. *See In re Vaeck,* 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

The subject claims relate to facilitating attributed debugging. Attributes are keyword-like tags in which additional information about entities can be specified and are saved with an assembly's metadata. (*See e.g.,* pg. 6, lns. 7-11.) A debugger application can refer to the information in the attributes to determine how objects should be used. (*See e.g., id.*) Attributed debugging employs the attribute(s) to facilitate debugging the application. (*See e.g., id.* at lns. 23-24.)

Independent claim 1, from which claims 5-7 and 13-16 depend, recites *a computer-implemented attributed debugging system, comprising a debugger ... and **an expression evaluator that evaluates an attribute associated with a computer software application according to an attribute definition** and presents debug information associated with the computer software application in accordance with the attribute definition, **the debug information is presented in a developer-customizable format.***

Thus, the presentation of the debug information can be modified based on the attribute definition. (*See e.g.,* pg. 8, lns 10-13.). The expression evaluator determines what information should be shown about a particular object, field and/or property. (*See e.g., id.*) Thus, an advantage of the subject claims is the identification and presentation of meaningful information. Conventional systems are limited and merely allow certain data to be eliminated from view, but do not add anything. (*See e.g.,* pg. 7, lns. 30-35.) Independent claims 17 (from which claim 18 and 19 depend) and independent claim 20, 21 and 22 recite limitations similar to the limitations of independent claim 1. The cited references fail to disclose or suggest at least these novel aspects recited in the subject claims.

Bates *et al.* relates to displaying variable usage while debugging, such as displaying the value of the variable and a comment associated with the variable. (*See e.g.,* Abstract.) Variable information includes comments, declaration location, use information, and next instances. (*See e.g.,* pg. 4, ¶[0042].) A debugger determines whether any attributes are set in fields 312-322 and whether the field should be displayed. (*See e.g.,* pg. 6, ¶¶ [0064] and [0065].) The fields 312-322 are set to "ON" by a compiler 121 if any of the variables are present in the associated field. (*See e.g.,* pg. 7, ¶¶ [0050] through [0055].) However, the fields are not attribute definitions nor does Bates, *et al.* teach or even suggest an expression evaluator that evaluates an attribute associated with a computer software application according to an attribute definition, as claimed. Additionally, as conceded in the Office Action, Bates *et al.* does not teach or suggest the debug information is presented in a developer-customizable format and Bates_2 is incorrectly relied upon to overcome the deficiencies of Bates *et al.*

Bates_2 relates to displaying user-selected fields or user-programmed fields for the variable or the record. (*See e.g.,* col. 3, lns. 52-55.) This simply allows certain data to be eliminated from view, but does not add anything. Additionally, Bates_2 when combined with Bates *et al.* does not teach or suggest an expression evaluator that evaluates an attribute associated with a computer software application according to an attribute definition, as claimed.

Based on at least the foregoing it is apparent that the combination of Bates *et al.* and Bates_2 does not teach or suggest each and every element of the subject claims and

further do not provide the advantage of identification and presentation of meaningful information as provided by the subject claims. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn and the subject claims allowed.

II.   Rejection of Claims 2-4 and 8-12 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 2, 4 and 8-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bates *et al.* in view of Bates_2 as applied to claims 1 and 7 above, and further in view of Dandoy (U.S. Application No. 2004/0230954). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reason. None of the cited references, alone or in combination, teach each and every element of the subject claims.

As discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, from which the subject claims depend, neither Bates *et al.* nor Bates_2 teach or suggest all claim limitations and Dandoy fails to make up for the deficiencies of Bates *et al.* and Bates_2. Dandoy relates to debugging a user interface. However, Dandoy, alone or when combined with Bates *et al.* and Bate_2, does not teach or suggest *an expression evaluator that evaluates an attribute associated with a computer software application according to an attribute definition ... the debug information is presented in a developer-customizable format,* as recited in independent claim 1.

Therefore, none of the cited references teach or suggest all claim limitations and, further, do not provide the advantage of identification and presentation of meaningful information as provided by the subject claims. Thus, it is requested that this rejection be withdrawn and the subject claims allowed.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP578US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/
Himanshu S. Amin
Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731